



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

07/256,689 10/12/88 CASKEY

C D-5050

THOMAS D. PAUL
PATENT DEPT.
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI
1301 MC KINNEY STREET
HOUSTON, TX 77010

187

07/16/91

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 4/23/91 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), ~~30~~ from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 9-17 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been canceled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-8 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/91 have been fully considered and they are deemed to be persuasive to overcome the rejections applied in the previous office action mailed 10/23/90. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 objections is reapplied and reiterated from the office action mailed 1/29/90. It constitutes the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kogan et al.

This rejection is reapplied as given in the office action mailed 1/29/90 for the following reason:

The affidavit filed on 7/31/90 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Kogan et al. reference. Affidavits filed to swear back of a reference under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 must be signed by all inventors. The signing of this document by only Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, Ph.D. is therefore insufficient. See MPEP 715.04.

Additionally applicants argue the Kogan et al. reference based on a multiple bands shown in Figure 1 of Kogan et al. as showing spurious results. The Examiner wishes to point out that applicants acknowledge that Kogan et al. is amplifying repetitive sequences. Such repetitive sequences are fully expected to produce multiple bands due to multiple sites at which primers can initiate the polymerase elongation reaction. Applicants go on to argue such aspects as primer composition, enzyme amount, and longer incubation times to accomplish the invention. These are standard optimization choices during enzyme reactions are acknowledged as such by applicants where they state that "PCR cycles performed must be optimized".

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first

response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

This application contains claims 9-17 drawn to an invention non-elected with traverse in Paper No. 7, filed 8/16/90. A complete response to the final rejection must include cancellation of non-elected claims or other appropriate action (37 C.F.R. § 1.144) M.P.E.P. § 821.01.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 180 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 180 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).


The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 308-4227.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., at telephone number: (703) 308-0196.

AM

A. MARSCHEL:am

July 12, 1991


ROBERT A. WAX
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 187